the advertising agency are given below: —

Year	Duration of ads telecast	Commission paid to the agency	List of clients
1985-36	5200 seconds	Rs. 8,36,249/-	(1) M/s Nitex Corporation,
1986-87	2780 seconds	Rs. 7,79,027/-	Ahmedabad (2) Amba Lai Sarabhai Enterprise Ltd., Bombay (3) UT1, Bombay (4) Cera Sanitary ware Ltd., Ahmedabad (5) Gujarat Narmada Fert. Ltd., Bharuch (6) Indian Petro Chemicals Ltd., Baroda (7) Midas Care, Bombay (8) Air Canada, Bombay (9) Nutrinc Confectionery, Bangalore (lO)Modela Textiles, Bombay (11) VIP Industries, Bombay (12) Reckit & Colman, Bombay (13) Mefco Ltd., Bombay.

te) Th$_c$ details of ads booked by the agency in the Super A time category during the period from 1st January, 87 to 31st October, 87 comes to 1870 seconds. Out of this, 420 seconds is on national channel and the remaining 1450 seconds on various Doordarshan Kendras.

(d) Yes, Sir. The details of programmes sponsored by M/s Shilpi Advertising from January this year is given below.—

Particulars of programmes Commis ion Paid Rs.

(i) Sponsorship of one 30 minut; part of regional feature film on the national network : 10,500/-

(ii) Sponsorship of 5 krishiDar-shan programmes over Delhi. LPT : 33,000/-

T.V. Serial Satyajit Ray Presnts

2135. SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH; Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state;

(a) whether it is a fact that TV sponsored serial titled "Satyajit Ray j Presents" wa$_s$ criticised by the Press and the viewers;

(b) whether it is also a fact that most of the episodes shown on the prime slot of 9.00 P.M. were'short cf their duration;

(c) if so, what action was taken by the concerned Deputy Director General Doordarshan to reject these episodes;

(d) whether it is also a fact that this serial was a short. film and this wa$_s$ divided into parts; and

(e) if so. who is responsible for showing such serial and whether any responsibility has been fixed on the concerned officer and if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI AJIT PANJA): (a) There has been mixed reaction to this serial from the Press and the viewers.

(b) and (c) No, Sir. Only a few episodes were found short of the ro-

quired duration. Whenever it was found so, the attention of the producer/director was drawn to that.

(d) The Government do not have any information about it.

(e) Does not arise.

Telecasting of Late Night Films

2137. SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) what is the amount of expendi ture incurred by the Doordarshan in telecasting one late night film;

(b) whether it is a fact that Gov ernment have stopped telecasting of late night films on Fridays upto March 31, 1988 in order to save money for drought relief;

(c) if so, what is the total amount likely to be saved upto March 31, 1988 by thi$_s$ decision;

(d) whether Government approach ed the advertisers for these late night films so that Government get revenue for fighting drought and people will benefit by the late night films; and

(e) if so, what are the results and if not, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI A JIT PANJA): (a) Doordarshan has paid royalty for telecast of 'late night films' as per following rate structure:

(i) Hindi/Regional films @ Rs. 3.5 lakhs per film.

(ii) Foreign films procured through the National Film Development Corporation of local T.V. right holders @ Rs. 1.75 lakhs per film.

(iii) Foreign films procured by directed negotiations from abroad as per the rates negotieted and agreed which ha$_s$ been varying from US D 5000 to 7500,

(I.) Telecast of 'late night films' has been suspended till the end of the current financial year as a measure of economy.

(c) Tht likely saving from suspen sion of telecast of 'late night films' would be approximately lis. 85 lakhs.

(d) and (e) Queries were made with the advertisers. But their res ponse was not encouraging.

दिल्ली में भवनों में आग से सुरक्षा के प्रबन्ध

2138. **श्रीमती रेणुका चौधरी :** क्या **शहरी विकास** मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि दिल्ली फायर सर्विस ने दिल्ली में लगभग एक सौ नौ सरकारी भवनों को असुरक्षित घोषित किया है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो ऐसे भवनों के नाम क्या हैं; और

(ग) सरकार इन भवनों में आग से सुरक्षा के आवश्यक प्रबन्ध कब तक करने का विचार रखती है ?

शहरी विकास मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री दलबीर सिंह) : (क) और (ख) दिल्ली में 120 गगनचुम्बी सरकारी भवनों को अग्नि सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से त्रुटिपूर्ण पाया गया (नाम अनलग्नक में दिये गये हैं) [देखिये परिशिष्ट CXLIV, अनुषंग सं० 94] इनमें से 40 भवन शहरी विकास मंत्रालय के नियंत्रणाधीन हैं जिनका अनुरक्षण केन्द्रीय लोक निर्माण विभाग द्वारा किया जाता है। इन 40 भवनों की स्थिति इस प्रकार है :-

(i) 8 भवन अपेक्षाओं को पूर्ण करते हैं तथा कोई अतिरिक्त सुविधाएं उपलब्ध करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है।